

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application. Claims 1-10 have been rejected. Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 9 and 10 have been amended. Claims 1-10 are now pending of which 1 and 5 are independent claims.

Reconsideration of all grounds of rejection in the Office Action based upon the above amendment, and allowance of all of the pending claims are respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

The base claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Support for these amendments are found in the specification on page 6, line 22 as well as the drawings as illustrated in FIG. 4 reference characters 110a-c, 120a-c, 140a-c, and Picocell 3-5, 30, 40 and 50. In addition, dependent claims 2 and 3 have been amended to properly depend from the base claim. No new matter has been added.

Dependent claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In response, applicants have amended the claims to reflect that each limitation (sensor or CSMA/CA method) is for controlling communication between each picocell in the UWB network in addition to passive optical switching disclosed in dependent claim 8. Support for these amendments are found in the specification on page 8, line 8 to 12. No new matter was added and the dependent claims now enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the present invention.

Dependent claims 3 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response, dependent claim 3 has been amended to provide proper dependency to dependent claim 2. Support for this feature is found in FIG. 3 and

4 (Reference characters 110 and 120). No new matter has been added. In amending dependent claim 10, applicants have corrected the ambiguity which was pointed out by the Examiner (method claim depending from an apparatus). Dependent claim 10 now reads ‘configured for’ a ‘CSMA/CA method.’ Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for pointing out this oversight.

Claim 1-9 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Koonen (US 6,674,966 b1) in view of Deas (US Pat Appl. Pub. No. 2004/0175173 A1). In response, applicants have amended the base claims, 1 and 5 and provide the following comments.

Claim 1, as amended now recites an apparatus for transmitting signals between, a central station, and a plurality of picocells within a UWB network comprising, *inter alia*, an optical signal transmission means for transmitting **one portion of the received optical signals to the signal converter** and **another portion of the received optical signals to a second picocell**.

Claim 5 provides a similar feature.

In contrast, Koonen provides an Optical Network Unit (ONU) comprising, *inter alia* a directional coupler for sending and receiving optical from a microwave directional coupler 34a. In other words, Koonen device does suggest or teach transmitting one portion of an optical signal between a signal converter and another portion of the received optical signal to a second picocell as disclosed in the present invention. Similarly, Deas does not suggest or teach the dividing of optical signals between a signal converter and a picocell but instead each ‘pedestal’ terminates as disclosed in Deas’s FIG. 6 (reference character number 606 and 609). Neither Koonen nor Deas device provide the ease of UWB network expansion as disclosed in the present invention whereas a new picocell can be added by “. . . simply connecting it to a port of the nearest module” (Page 9, line 4-5). Therefore, neither reference discloses, suggests or teaches an optical


signal transmission means for transmitting one portion of the received optical signals to the signal converter and another portion of the received optical signals to a second picocell as recited in the amended base claims.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claim discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the present claims are patentable in view of the cited reference. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Cha  
Registration No. 44,069



Date: November 27, 2006

By: Steve Cha  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 44,069


Mail all correspondence to:

Steve Cha, Registration No. 44,069  
Cha & Reiter  
210 Route 4 East, #103  
Paramus, NJ 07652  
Tel: 201-226-9245  
Fax: 201-226-9246

**Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on November 27, 2006.

Steve Cha, Reg. No. 44,069  
(Name of Registered Rep.)

  
(Signature and Date)